

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1.	Qualification status of TOUGH2 related software	1
Figure 2.	Relationship of TOUGH, TOUGH2 (and modules) and ITOUGH2 to the MULKOM architecture	2
Figure 3.	Structure of TOUGH2 single-phase gas (EOS1G) and saturated/unsaturated flow (EOS9) modules.....	9-10
Figure 4.	Summary of single-phase gas module program units and version history.	11-12
Figure 5.	Structure of T2R3D:TOUGH2 radionuclide transport module	13-14
Figure 6.	Summary of radionuclide transport module program units and version history	15
Figure 7.	Schematic of spacial averaging scheme for velocity fields in the integral finite differences method	22
Figure 8.	Time dependent pressures for the boundary condition data input table to TOUGH2 and the TOUGH2 simulated boundary pressures.....	35
Figure 9.	Time dependent pressures for the TOUGH2 simulations using the EOS3 module and the single-phase gas module (EOS1G).....	36
Figure 10.	One-dimensional vertical grid for the unsaturated zone of Yucca Mountain used for the ECM comparison study.	37
Figure 11.	Steady-state liquid saturation profiles for fractures and matrix, obtained using the ECM and the dual-permeability models.....	39
Figure 12.	Comparison of the simulated liquid saturation profiles using the ECM and the dual-pemeability modelsf with reducion of fracture-matrix interface areas	40
Figure 13.	Liquid saturation profiles for TOUGH2 verification problem 1, using EOS9 and EOS3 and harmonic-mean interface weighting of mobilities.	41
Figure 14.	Comparison of the normalized radionuclide concentrations along the rock column from the T2R3D and analytical solution.....	42
Figure 15.	Schematic of the 2-D model domain for the two-dimensional radionuclide transport problem showing the velocity field and three cross sections for comparisons of the simulation results.	43
Figure 16.	Comparison of radionuclide concentration profiles along cross section (A-A') for analytical and numerical solutions at t=20 days.....	44

Figure 17.	Comparison of radionuclide concentration profiles along cross section (B-B') for analytical and numerical solutions at t=20 days.....	45
Figure 18.	Comparison of radionuclide concentration profiles along cross section (C-C') for analytical and numerical solutions at t=20 days.....	45
Figure 19.	Space discretization and geometry data in the integral finite difference method.....	57
Figure 20.	Input file for sample problem 1 - EOS1G demonstration.	60
Figure 21.	Selected output for sample problem 1 - EOS1G demonstration.....	61
Figure 22.	Input file for sample problem 2 - ECM demonstration.	65
Figure 23.	Selected output for sample problem 2.	65
Figure 24.	Input file for sample problem 3 - EOS9 demonstration.	66-67
Figure 25.	Selected output for sample problem 3.	68
Figure 26.	Input file for sample problem 4 - T2R3D demonstration.....	69
Figure 27.	Selected output for sample problem 4..	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1.	TOUGH2 Single-Phase gas and saturated/unsaturated flow module properties.....	8
Table 2.	TOUGH2 Fluid Property Module for Two-Phase Flow and Radionuclide Transport	14
Table 3.	Primary Thermodynamic Variables.....	18
Table 4.	Summary of EOS1G	27
Table 5.	Summary of EOS9.....	28
Table 6.	Summary of EOSR3D	29
Table 7.	Summary of Validation Problems for TOUGH2 Modules.....	34
Table 8.	The fracture porosity, aperture and spacing data used for the comparison study (Wilson et al., 1994).	37
Table 9.	The rock properties of matrix and fractures used in the ECM comparison study.....	38
Table 10.	Requirements Validation Cross-Check.....	47-48